

21004

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 8

both Estle Rucker, was a pianist and teacher. She learned French and Italian there.

She dropped the Elizabeth from her name during her school years to avoid being called "Lizzie."

After attending Washington University in St. Louis for a year, she married lawyer Carleton S. Hadley, in 1931, when she was 19. When he died in 1945, she went to work as a secretary, handling foreign correspondence for the school.

Mrs. Barkley was first linked romantically with the Vice President in the summer of 1949, when she met him on a cruise given in her honor by the Clark Cliffords. The public was kept guessing as the two continued seeing each other. The marriage was announced in late October.

Two months before the wedding, Vice President Barkley was asked whether he had proposed. He said he hadn't. "I have no way of knowing whether I'll make the grade," he added.

He did. Their scheduled "small" wedding on November 18, 1949, drew 700 guests and Mrs. Barkley was the toast of Washington society the following season.

When her husband died in 1956, she was one of the people considered for an interim appointment to the Senate seat he held.

In 1957, she wrote, "I Married the Veep," telling about her life in Washington. That year she was squirmed around town by House Speaker Sam Rayburn, but denied reports of another romance.

Mrs. Barkley became appointments secretary to the late Thomas Henry Carroll II, former president of George Washington University, in 1962.

She is survived by her mother, with whom she lived at 4515 Connecticut Avenue, NW.; two daughters, Jane H. Perry, of 5300 Wilely Road, NW., and Anne Behrend, of Omaha, Nebr.; a sister, Ann Estle Lyon, of 1201 South Scott Street, Arlington; a brother, William W. Rucker, of Tampa, Fla., and four grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held at 2 p.m. Tuesday at Joseph Gawler's Sons, Inc., Wisconsin Avenue and Harrison Street, NW. The family has requested contributions to the American Heart Association instead of flowers.

[From the New York Times]

Mrs. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, 52, DIES; WIDOW OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, September 6.—Mrs. Jane Hadley Barkley, widow of Alben W. Barkley, Vice President of the United States in the administration of former President Harry S. Truman, died today at her home. She was 52 years old.

Mrs. Barkley was a 38-year-old widow when she and the Vice President, then 71 years old, were married in St. Louis in 1949. He died in 1956 after returning to the Senate.

Mrs. Barkley's survivors include her mother, Mrs. Estelle Rucker; two daughters, Mrs. Jane Perry of Bethesda, Md., and Mrs. Anne Behrend of Omaha; a sister, Mrs. Estelle Lyon of Arlington, Va., and a brother, William Rucker of Tampa, Fla.

Funeral arrangements have not yet been announced.

#### WHIRLWIND COURTSHIP

The Vice President conducted a whirlwind campaign for the hand of Mrs. Carleton S. Hadley, widow of a St. Louis railroad lawyer. They had met in July 1949, and were married in November.

Mrs. Barkley recalled in her book "I Married the Veep," published in 1958, that at their first meeting, aboard a small river cruiser on the Potomac, Mr. Barkley held her hand so firmly, "that I couldn't figure out how to free my poor imprisoned hand."

They met frequently afterward at parties, and he wrote her many letters.

Mrs. Barkley was born in Keytesville, Mo., and named Elizabeth Jane Rucker. She dropped the Elizabeth to avoid being called "Lizzie," she said. She was educated in Europe, where her mother was a pianist and teacher.

At the age of 19 she was married to Mr. Hadley, who later became general counsel of the Wabash Railroad in St. Louis. He died of a heart attack in 1945 at the age of 42.

His widow then went to work as a secretary at Washington University and, a few months later, became secretary to the man who had succeeded her husband at the Wabash.

She met Mr. Barkley by chance through her friendship with Mr. and Mrs. Clark Clifford of St. Louis. Mr. Clifford was then special counsel to President Truman.

Through that summer the Vice President parried the questions of friendly reporters on his marriage plans when they learned that he was making visits to St. Louis. Once, he quipped that he had not yet proposed marriage "because I have no way of knowing whether I'll make the grade."

The wedding was planned at first to be small, but some 7,000 people were waiting outside the Singleton Memorial Chapel of St. John's Methodist Church that November day to greet the Vice President and his bride. Mrs. Barkley plunged into political campaigning and the Washington social world with her husband.

She joined him on a trip to Korea during the Korean war. She walked with him on a celebrated stroll from the railroad station to his hotel in 1952 at the time of the Democratic National Convention to prove that he was not too old to be a candidate for President.

In recent years, Mrs. Barkley was appointed secretary to Thomas Henry Carroll, president of George Washington University.

Mrs. JANE BARKLEY, 52, VEEP'S WIDOW, DIES

Mrs. Jane Barkley, 52, who married Vice President Alben W. Barkley after a 4-month storybook courtship 15 years ago, died yesterday in her Connecticut Avenue apartment.

An autopsy showed evidence of heart disease, but the coroner's office withheld a ruling until further tests can be completed. Mrs. Barkley was found dead in her bed.

On November 18, 1949, photographs in newspapers across the country showed Mrs. Barkley smiling through tears of happiness as she was led to the altar by the witty and genial former Kentucky Senator. She was 38 then and "the Veep" was 71.

#### AT SIDE WHEN HE DIED

Six and a half years later, on April 30, 1956, she rushed to Mr. Barkley's side when he collapsed and died while addressing a mock Democratic convention at Washington and Lee University at Lexington, Va.

Mr. Barkley, again a Senator from Kentucky, had just declared, "I would rather be a servant in the house of the Lord than to sit in the seats of the mighty." Mrs. Barkley was in the audience.

Later, she returned to secretarial work, and at the time of her death was administrative assistant to Oswald S. Colclough, acting president of George Washington University.

#### WED FIRST IN 1943

Born Elizabeth Jane Rucker in Keytesville, Mo., she was educated in Switzerland and Italy, where her mother was a pianist and music teacher. Her father was a lawyer and her grandfather, William J. Rucker, was a Member of Congress whom Mr. Barkley had known at the beginning of his career.

At 19, she left Washington University to marry Carleton S. Hadley, a lawyer who died in 1943.

The Vice President and Mrs. Hadley met

in the summer of 1949 at a party given by the Clark Cliffords on the Presidential launch, *Margie*. Mrs. Barkley's first husband had been best man at the Cliffords' wedding. It was obvious that they hit it off, but knowing Mr. Barkley's old world gallantry toward the other sex, no one paid much attention.

The next morning, however, the Vice President called Mrs. Clifford and asked her to tell him everything about Mrs. Hadley. (His first wife, whom he married in 1903, died in 1947 after a long illness.) Three days later he gave a luncheon for her in the Senate, followed up by a cocktail party that afternoon.

The Vice President then began making weekend visits to the St. Louis widow, engaging the American people as partisans in the courtship long before he became engaged himself.

#### VEEP WAS UNCERTAIN

Only 2 months before the wedding, Mr. Barkley was asked whether he had popped the question. He said he hadn't because "I have no way of knowing whether I'll make the grade."

He did, and the projected "small" wedding in St. Louis finally wound up with some 7,000 guests. The new Mrs. Barkley was the toast of Washington social circles when the couple returned here.

Mrs. Barkley described the romance in a 130-page book called "I Married the Veep," published in 1958. She called herself "an overage Cinderella."

A Republican before her marriage to Mr. Barkley, she was an ardent supporter of Wendell Willkie, the GOP presidential candidate in 1940. She once tried to convert her Democratic milkman by leaving him a note reading, "No Willkie, No Milkie."

#### CHANGED PARTIES

She switched parties after her second marriage and campaigned for Democratic candidates in the 1950 elections.

She is survived by her mother, with whom she lived at 4514 Connecticut Avenue NW.; two daughters, Jane H. Perry, of 5300 Wilely Road, Bethesda, and Anne Behrend, of Omaha, Nebr.; a sister, Mrs. Estelle Lyon, of 1201 South Scott Street, Arlington; and a brother, William Rucker, of Tampa, Fla.

Funeral services will be at 2 p.m. tomorrow at the Joseph Gawler's Sons Funeral Home, Wisconsin Avenue and Harrison Street NW., with the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, the Senate Chaplain, officiating. The burial will be private.

The family asks that expressions of sympathy take the form of contributions to the American Heart Association.

#### AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

#### REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES— FILING OF CLOSURE MOTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a series of parliamentary inquiries.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, when a cloture motion is filed, there will be one intervening day before it comes to the floor of the Senate for a vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate must be in session on 1 intervening day. The Senator is correct.

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21005

Mr. DIRKSEN. Which is to say that if the cloture motion were to be filed, it would automatically be voted on on Thursday of this week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that when the cloture motion is to be taken up, a quorum call is automatic under the rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct—1 hour after convening of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The intervening hour before the vote can be devoted to a discussion of the cloture motion, but the rule makes no provision for the division of time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. There is no provision for division of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I direct an inquiry to the Chair as to whether it has been customary to divide that 1 hour between the proponents and the opponents.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that it has been customary to proceed with morning business. But on the other hand, the Chair recalls that the last two times a cloture motion was filed, the hour was divided between the proponents and the opponents of the motion by unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Suppose the sponsor of the cloture motion—who would normally, I believe, be recognized by the Chair—undertakes to keep all the time and farm it out according to his likes; does that come within the rule?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The farming out of time is against the rule. Whoever occupied the Chair probably would strictly interpret the rule so that the Senator who had the floor would have to stay within the rules of the Senate.

The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the regular morning hour would be in order, unless there were some agreement as to—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would it be in order at this time to ask for a division of the time on Thursday next, in view of the fact that I propose to file a cloture motion?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would be in order, on the assumption that the cloture petition will be filed and that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] can ask unanimous consent for a division of time for the hour on the morning of Thursday, provided the Senate is in session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I shall make that request directly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator requesting that there shall be a division of time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall ask for that after I read the title to the motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It reads:

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the amendment, relative to apportionment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], numbered 1215, to the bill (H.R. 11380), an act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the Presiding Officer must read the cloture motion. The Chair asks unanimous consent that the clerk may now read the motion instead of the Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE PETITION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the amendment, relative to reapportionment, offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], numbered 1215, to the bill H.R. 11380, an act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended and for other purposes.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, JAMES O. EASTLAND, FRANK CARLSON, ROMAN L. HRUSKA, LEN B. JORDAN, MIKE MONRONEY, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, JAMES B. PEARSON, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, NORRIS COTTON, GORDON ALLOTT, JACK R. MILLER, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, WALLACE F. BENNETT, CARL T. CURTIS, HIRAM L. FONG, E. L. MECHAM.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the cloture motion now filed, I ask unanimous consent that the hour to be made available at the time this matter is presented to the Senate be equally divided between myself and anyone whom the opposition to cloture may designate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I probably shall not do so—would not the Senator from Illinois agree that the time allotted to the opponents of the cloture motion may be divided in any way the opponents may collectively agree, rather than be given to any one Senator?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection. I believe that in the interest of an organized and expeditious arrangement some one Senator ought to handle it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It occurred to me that the normal procedure for controlled time for the hour would be more desirable than to attempt to have a unanimous-consent agreement now. I have no doubt that the proponents of cloture would be only too happy to have the able Senator from Illinois take all the time. Some of us who are opposed to cloture would perhaps prefer to have a little more democratic process, by which the time would be divided among several Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the opponents can get together, that would be agreeable to me.

Mr. CLARK. Why do we not try?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that the Senator from Pennsylvania in turn suggest to the Chair the name of the Senator who should handle the allotment of time. The opponents may want to ration the time among the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and others. The opponents may have a ration table of their own.

Mr. CLARK. Did I misunderstand the Senator in his unanimous-consent request? Did the Senator provide that the time for the opponents of cloture should be controlled and divided by one individual Senator?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection to the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the cloture motion that has just been filed is—on the basis of study made by my staff—unprecedented. The Dirksen amendment was attached to the foreign aid bill without hearings or other legislative action. It was a bolt from the blue. Yet, it would deprive a majority of our citizens of the right to equal representation in their State governments for at least 2 years, and, if a constitutional amendment were passed by malapportioned State legislatures, for all time. This is why it is unprecedented: I believe there has never been a time when debate has been ended with such little opportunity for discussion.

How much time has been spent by the Senate in debating this all-important proposal prior to the introduction of a cloture motion? On the basis of the most optimistic, conservative estimates, of the number of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages covering the debate, a total of 26½ hours, pro and con, have been consumed on this subject. This would be the shortest cloture debate on record.

Time and again, those of us opposing the Dirksen amendment have agreed to postpone consideration of this legislation so that other measures, such as the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill and the Social Security Amendments of 1964 could be acted upon.

From Thursday, August 13, the day the reapportionment amendment was laid aside so that the social security measure could be taken up, the Senate passed 89 bills and 32 resolutions, adopted 17 conference reports, and sent 10 bills to conference. This legislation probably constitutes the largest number of measures acted upon during any comparable period in the 88th Congress. During most of that period of time, the Dirksen amendment was set aside while other business was discussed and acted upon.

Mr. President, surely a measure which not only overrides the principle of one-man, one-vote, but also raises serious constitutional questions as to the independence of our courts from legislative

coercion, does not deserve such short shift. I urge Senators not to act without further debate on this legislation.

There has been no delaying action; no live quorums called by those of who oppose the Dirksen amendment. There has been no nongermane debate. And there has been no real opportunity for many Senators who oppose the Dirksen amendment to speak. We have a list of Senators who want to speak against the Dirksen amendment. They have not had an opportunity to do so. Some of them wish to speak for 2 or 3 hours. This is a subject of great importance. Senators will be gagged if we cannot persuade our colleague to vote against a cloture motion.

I have been one of those who voted quite consistently for cloture. Yet, there are times when this body, which is recognized throughout the world as one which permits a substantial amount of discussion and debate, should have sufficient time in which to explore serious questions before the Senate.

With the limited time now available, it seems to me it would make sense for Senators who oppose the Dirksen cloture motion to have an opportunity to discuss such an important question in greater detail.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

#### CONFLICT AND UNITY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, later today I intend to make some remarks about the current campaign. But I should like to say at this point that I was shocked by the kind of attack made by Representative MILLER upon our colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

As the majority leader has stated, "this was one of the most vicious, false, and malicious documents in American political history."

This kind of attack is destructive of the spirit of our democracy. Our institutions are not designed to operate efficiently when there is no restraint upon distortion and falsehood.

Some 10 years ago, our democratic system was severely strained by a technique known as the "big lie" or the "big doubt" a form of misrepresentation of the facts brought to a high degree of perfection by the late Senator McCarthy from Wisconsin.

The Senate formally censured the late Senator from Wisconsin; and I believe the people of this country will censure, by their votes in November, the Representative from New York [Mr. MILLER].

The statements by Representative MILLER confirm the observation made at the time, that he was chosen for the job of hatchet man, not because he is well-known or a man of stature, but because he is capable of the most foul-mouthed vituperation and unrestrained misrepresentation of any man in public life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Conflict and Unity."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1964]

#### CONFLICT AND UNITY

The campaign opened, officially, on Saturday; and it seems plain that the country is going to be in for a boisterous and strident time until election day, come November. President Johnson took note of the opening by a news conference plea for national unity and understanding. But his plea had to be heard over the crackle and static of two rousing, tub-thumping, name-calling speeches by the rival vice-presidential candidates.

The elocutionary honors of the day went, we thought, to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the GOP presidential nominee, who indulged in nothing more than a brief introduction of his running mate, WILLIAM E. MILLER, at Lockport, N.Y. It would be too much, perhaps, to say that the Senator's speech was characterized by good humor; it did contain humor, however—barbed and enlivening. He glibed at Mr. Robert Kennedy, until a few days ago the Attorney General of the United States, now a New Yorker running for election to the Senate from that State. Mr. Kennedy must regard New York as a nice place to represent, the Senator observed, "but he wouldn't want to live here." And he added that Kennedy must be running on "a commuter ticket."

That was about all the humor of any kind that the day brought forth. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, opening the Democratic drive at Minneapolis, hammered away at his party's theme that Senator GOLDWATER is "trigger happy" and "irresponsible," while lauding President Johnson as "a giant of a man."

Congressman MILLER confined himself almost entirely to denunciation. He has been widely characterized as a "gut fighter" and appears to regard this somewhat unattractive appellation as an accolade. He demonstrated beyond contradiction, at any rate, that he deserves it. He indulged in a personal attack on Senator HUMPHREY which, for sheer irrationality and imputation of evil has been unrivaled in American politics for many a decade.

The GOP seems to have decided to run against the ADA—that is, against Americans for Democratic Action, a small, energetic, liberal group which has contributed numerous constructive proposals to the country's political dialog. Senator HUMPHREY has long been a member and an officer of ADA. Mr. MILLER began by imputing to the organization ideas which it has never advocated, went on to impute these ideas to Mr. HUMPHREY, despite the Senator's long and brilliant record of opposition to them as a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and ended by imputing them to President Johnson. This is very different indeed from Senator HUMPHREY's acceptance speech at Atlantic City—of which the Miller speech was an obvious imitation. Senator HUMPHREY assailed Senator GOLDWATER by citing a series of specific RECORD votes in the Senate in which the GOP candidate himself voted in opposition to a majority of his fellow Republicans.

This is not so much gut fighting as it is gutter fighting. And the country will be the poorer if it is allowed to continue. Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD called this attack "one of the most vicious, false and malicious documents in American political history." There is a recklessness and meanness in Mr. MILLER's kind of politicking which pose a terrible danger to the country. Anyone who fights in this way for public office demonstrates that he does not deserve it.

There has always been a lot of roughness and extravagance in American politics. This

country can take this kind of robustness when it falls within the traditional bounds of decency and good taste and when it recognizes the essential good faith and loyalty of political opponents. What Mr. MILLER did on Saturday, however, was to prove that President Johnson was quite right in his assertion that "this Nation's most important concern, as far as we can see ahead, is and should be the unity of this country."

National unity is not a product of uniformity of opinion. It grows out of the resolution of conflict through the democratic process of debate and discussion. There are real differences of opinion and philosophy between the nominees of the two major parties. They ought to be aired vigorously. Debate does not require confrontation of candidates before television cameras. It requires confrontation of ideas.

Let the candidates say as vehemently as they please what they think about the control and use of nuclear weapons, about Medicare and social security, about the ways in which to assure civil rights to American citizens, about how to maintain order in the streets of great American cities, about taxes and budgetary deficits and other economic issues, about the whole long range of difficult problems facing America.

But let us put a stop now to the fracturing of America—the inculcation of hatred and distrust and the pitting of race against race, of section against section. It is for a Nation that the coming election is to choose a government. It is for the Presidency of a United States that the rivals are now seeking public confidence.

#### A NEW PHILOSOPHY: HUMAN BEINGS ARE NO LONGER RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT THEY DO

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in the September 3 issue of the Washington Evening Star an excellent column by Jenkin Lloyd Jones on the "new sociology" which seems to now prevail in this country.

This, unfortunately, is the philosophy that human beings are no longer responsible for what they do, but that instead it is society that really must take the blame. We have seen the results of this new philosophy in city after city where lawlessness has become a virtual way of life for untold numbers. We have reached such a sad state of affairs that there appears to be more concern over the plight of the criminal than for the law abiding.

Mr. Jones' column is worthy of wide dissemination, and indeed I would urge that it be read by everyone who would deny the concept of individual responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TIME FOR THE NEW-NEW SOCIOLOGY

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The coed was telling me about her year in a famous eastern university.

"The courses were just wonderful," she bubbled. "All except sociology."

"What was wrong with sociology?"

"It was so unreal," she replied. "For two semesters we sat through lectures in which evil things were discussed, but evil was never admitted. Criminals were never responsible